#### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-26 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Claims 7, 8, 13, and 14 have been cancelled herein. A listing of all pending claims is found at pages 2-6 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

## I. <u>Elections/Restrictions Under 35 U.S.C. §121</u>

The Examiner has required restriction of the subject claims to one of the following groups pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 26, drawn to an apparatus (combination), classified in class 156, subclass 345.24.
- II. Claims 15-20, drawn to an apparatus (subcombination), classified in class 356, subclass 355.
- III. Claims 21-24, drawn to a method, classified in class 216, subclass 60.

Applicants' representative hereby affirms the election of Group I (claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 26) made telephonically on February 10, 2005. Accordingly, claims 15-24 have been withdrawn by the Examiner pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

### II. Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the driving system" set forth in the last paragraph of claim 1, line 3. The Examiner has suggested that "the driving system" be changed to "the driving component." Claim 1 has been amended herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim 7 and 14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 4; similarly claims 8 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 5. Claims 7-8 and 13-14 have been cancelled herein to

address the duplicity issue noted by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

# III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-14-, 25, and 26 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1,2,4-14, 25 and 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,562,248 B1. A Terminal Disclaimer of U.S. Patent No. 6,562,248 B1 is being filed concurrently herewith. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

## IV. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Subramanian *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,562,248 B1). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection for at least the following reasons. As set forth above in Section III, a Terminal Disclaimer of U.S. Patent No. 6,562,248 B1 is being filed concurrently herewith, and it is believed therefore that the subject rejection is moot. In view of at least the above, this rejection should be withdrawn.

09/955,517

G0228/AMDP753US

### CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Himanshu S. Amin Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center 1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Telephone (216) 696-8730 Facsimile (216) 696-8731